

by
A Stone returning upon him that
Roll'd it :

O R,

An ANSWER

UNTO

SELF-CONDEMNATION,

Holding forth both the Weakness
and Wickedness of that Episcopal
Author ; and confirming the se-
cond Edition of the Debate in
the Shop.

By the Presbyterian Concern'd.

Prov. 26. 27. — *He that rolls a Stone it will return upon him.*

Acts 8. 9. — *Giving out that himself was some great One.*

Psal. 10. 5. — *As for all his enemies he puffs at them.*

Zeph. 3. 5. — *The unjust, knows no shame.*

Prov. 21. 24. — *Proud and Haughty Scorners is his Name, that deals in Proud wrath.*

Printed Anno 1703.

A Stone remaining upon him that
Roll'd it :

AN ANSWER

TO
SELF-CONDEMNATION.

Holding forth both the Weakness
and Wickedness of that Episcopal
Author ; examining the 16-
cond Edition of the Debate in
the shop.



By the Presbyterian Concern'd.

Nov. 20. 27. — He that rolls a Stone it will return upon him.
Nov. 28. 27. — Giving out that his self was found great One.
Nov. 29. 27. — As for a Whistle in the hand he will be heard.
Nov. 30. 27. — The Devil's language is lying.

Nov. 31. 27. — From the Hanging scoundrel is his name, that he
does not know.

Printed Anno 1703.

A Stone returning upon him that roll'd it.

THis heady Zélot for Imparity among Pastors has oftner than once bewrayed his mighty Dissemper, and tho' a gentle Doze for allaying thereof was lately offered by a second Edition of the Debate &c. Yet such is the malignity of superabounding humour, that nothing has followed, but nauseous Evacuations, the superfluity of his Naughtiness exposed by himself to open view is so very considerable that it is a question if the most virulent Jesuit has ever exceeded him in abusing of Protestants. I am now by these presents sending him another Doze; and what more corrupt Hoss & venom it may draw from his Brains and Bowells, his Countrey men will understand by his next.

Tho' the very reading over of such an extravagant lybell, at his *Self-Condémnation*, be accounted by Wise men to be but a waste of precious time, and much more the taking it into consideration, Yet knowing there is Scripture allowance for answering such a man, as he is, according to his character, I shall not decline to do what may be convenient, I have no mind to trudge after him through his many pitifull Raveries. Left I should render myself as ridiculous as he is. But all I now design is only to meet with him in things worth the regarding, (if there be any such) for his Conviction, if possible, and for the undeceiving of others that may be impos'd upon.

The first thing that puts him in a ferment at the second Edition is the Scripture on the title Page thereof: Prov. 14. 16. He tells Page 19 I have posted him in a raging confident fools coat; and Page 15. l. 5. he comes over it again as a thing that he cannot digest; Unto which I make no other reply, but tell him that according to the opinion of wiser than either he or I, yea even some of his own Faction he has no need of any such Coat at all for the man that has so much signalized himself by these made-cape pieces of Imparity among Pastors, and his Self-Condémnation is sufficiently known without a Coat who ever reads them may observe from every page that the Author is raging and confident enough, and therefore the same kind of man the Scripture calls him, for the Scripture cannot be broken.

He sets out with a mighty parad, shewing how he will overturn all that

said

fold against him in the second Edition, and how he'll Defeat and baffle the Author thereof; He doth mightily triumph before the Victory; But let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that puts it off. 1 Kings 20: 11.

P. 4. l. 9 He undertakes that these things he'll labour to do in the spirit of Meekness, without giving bad Names, or scurrilous Language; But behold without any regard either to his Conscience or Credite he runs through all these sheets of his in a strain quite contraire to his Undertaking. If he had said he would labour to do these things in the spirit of *Madness*, and not the spirit of *Meekness*, without giving honest Names, and sober Language, then he had been consistent with himself; But now it is obvious to any Reader of common sense, that his promise and performance do manifestly contradict one another. To resume all his foolish, frantick and scurrill like expressions, were almost to transcribe his whole Pamphlet, and that would justly be counted absurd. Wherefore let these few of his many words suffice for the interim to evince what is said.

P. 6. Near the close, Ty upon you, for a man of mettall, Ty on you for a goodly disprant &c. P. 10 l. 6. He made an Answer, as if he had no more exercise of reason than Dunces, Blocks, and Stones have. And P. 11 l. 19. Presbyterians, Quakers, and other Sectaries are all in the same boat, speaking what is false &c. P. 10 l. 1. Tho the Apostle Paul were on Earth, and argued from his own writings, as I do, he would lose his labour &c. P. 4 l. 11. Justo Dei judicio he hath involved himself, as Buzazer in his iron grate. Let his wisdom be carried about &c. P. 19 l. 12. I sometimes say, I'd as soon, or rather turn an horn'd Ox, or a Cow, ere I turn'd Presbyterian P. 11 l. 26. He resembles himself to an old Tike that bites sore. And in effect the Reader may perceive that Shameless Shimel and railing Rabbakeh had as much meekness and sobriety as this Episcopall Rabbi.

He gives it out P. 4 l. 17. that I occasioned the Debate in the Shop, and how was that, just at the appearance of a man going about his Business occasions an old Tyke to get up and bark, against him without any provocation given him by the man, none can reasonably say that the man is to be blamed, but only the ill nature of the Tyke moves him upon such an occasion to be the first Aggressor, and so it was in this Case.

P. 14 l. 16, 17. This raging wave foams out his own shame, and Proclaims himself to be the man that needs not the Coat he speaks of. Let the Reader consider the title of his former Pamphlet, *Imparity among Pastors* by Divine Institution as maintained in a Debate by an Episcopall Divine, and

P. 11. at the close and 13. of that Pamphlet, His own words were: We be-
lieve Episcopacy to be the Government of the Church by Divine Institution,
which upon his denyall was proved, because Imparity among Pastors, was
clear from the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, upon which the Presbyterian
replied, that there was no Imparity among Church-officers of the same
office &c. Again Consider that he goes upon the matter P. 13. of Self-
Condemnation, that Imparity among those of the same office was under Con-
sideration. Notwithstanding of all which he asserts this to be a down right
falshood that Imparity among the same kind of Office-bearers (i. ordinary
Pastors etc.) was under our Consideration. Now let the Reader compare
things together, and see if he does not baffle himself: was not that under
consideration, which was the very ground of Controversie, by his own ac-
knowledgement? But, says he, I barr'd it from the Debate, and it was ex-
pressly excepted by me from the debate? and this the witnesses testified to his
face &c. Very well Sir, All then who read this under your own hand may
see your arrogant presumption is sufficiently attested: what Right had you
to frame the state of the Controversie as you pleased, and to obtrude it upon
me without my own consent, when I was as much concern'd therein as you?
Is not the Defendant as much concern'd, yet main in choosing the ground he
will stand upon, as the Opponent? Have you any Witnesses to attest that
I likewise excluded and excepted that from the Debate which you say you
did not adduce that which you can do not to the disadvantage of it. The Witnesses,
then according to your report so attest it. May your self now make it cer-
tain to all that can read your Paper, that you are a very Shameless Whore,
and that in seeking to defame me you have boophtfully disgrac'd your self.
Before I leave this part of his bitter Reproof, there is one thing I cannot
but notice, P. 17. He says, that he sees it acknowledged by me in the se-
cond Edition, that he excluded and barr'd from our Debate Imparity among
Pastors, whether extraordinary, or ordinary; (might he not as blash at such
presumption?) Whereupon he insinuates a mighty one, as if he had got me
in the Net of Self-condemnation and Self-contradiction. But what are these
words of mine that contain this acknowledgement? I reported that he said
he would not debate for one Apostle being above another, nor against
that that ordinary Pastors are all of the same office in the Church, and yet
there was an Imparity among them, whereby he says he sees it acknowledged
by me that he excluded from the Debate, as above; Now what a sharp-
sighted man must he be, who sees that which none else can see, may which
is not to be seen at all, this is much more than the second sight, whether
these his capricious stretches be the Fruit of his Weakness or his Wickedness,

or both, I leave to others to consider.

After all the bustle that's made by this raging and confident man about the subject of Debate, whereby he has demonstrate himself to have no need of the Quot he spoke of; he offers to vindicate his solid and unanswerable Arguments he called it; from the just exceptions made against it; and that the whole may appear in its true light, take the Argument as he sets it down in his Impartie P. 26 and it runs thus,

If the Presbyterians answer calling a standing Ministry by Impartie extraordinary and temporary be good and relevant against Episcopall Divines arguing from known Texts for the forsaide Ministry; Then the same answer given by the Quakers to the Presbyterians arguing for a standing Ministry by Paritie &c. is good and relevant against the Presbyterians.

But you (Presbyterians) will not grant this, Therefore you must not plead that,

To this I answered, It was a bad Syllogism, being a fallacious Sophism; and what (second Edition, P. 9.) Because it concludes nothing at all against Presbyterians, who hold there is no standing Ministry by Impartie of Divine Appointment, and so they give no such answer and plead no such thing as he alleges. He replies in his Self-Condensation P. 21 Ch. 8. He palpably betrays his want of Logick, while he tells us, Logicians make such an Argument to be a Sophism; and P. 164: 1. If it be a Sophism, he is bound to show what head it's reducible unto,

For answer, this mercurial Logician acknowledges P. 21 part last: That there is such a kind of Sophism which Logicians call fallacia ad Ignorantiam. Elechi, and that the said fallacie consists in this, that the Arguer does not infer the true, but the apparent contradictory of the Thesis, or what was denied or affirmed Very well, Sir, You have by this concession given just Judgement against your own argument, such a Sophism it is indeed and one of the worst for whatever appearance of a true argument you would make it to have against Presbyterians; for it really concludes nothing against them, as is said above but implies a falshood. Moreover, Do not good Logicians as you even tell us that *qui aliud concludit quàm quod dicitur* & *verum sit, esse contra-positum* & *idcirco committit Ignorantiam*. Elechi. You may easily know them, for they are much more famous than ever you will be for all your vain Ostentation, who then, except Doctor Ignorance, or Doctor Impudence can deny that Logicians make such an Argument to be a kind of Sophism.

P. 154: 9. He shows what he means by a standing Ministry by Impartie in his argument. I mean (says he) a Ministry by Impartie which Episcopallians believe to be, and call ordinary perpetual &c. a Ministry by Prelate, Pastor,

(Pastors, Timothy and Titus over other Pastors in Ephesus and Crete with power of Ordination and Jurisdiction as time quibet non (at least in Ecclesia constituta.

I suppose, Friend, that you are not of that mind that the personal Ministry of Timothy and Titus is perpetual, seeing they are long ago gone off the Stage, but that in their Life time they were Prelate Pastors over other Pastors; and that Timothy had the power of Ordination & Jurisdiction; at least, the quonon, and that this his said power was confined to Ephesus, or the proconsular Asia; for thus you declare your mind. R. 10 at beg. You are for the whole proconsular Asia to have been his charge (now take heed lest you myre your self for that contained Asia Jonia and some part of Lydia; within which bounds were the most part of the seven Churches; every one whereof had an Angel (which you expound of a Bishop) as well as Ephesus; and having as much power and so you are in a mistake about Timothies charge.) The like no doubt you believe concerning Titus *consideratis consideratis*. And finally from these Scripture examples of Prelacie, as you imagine them to be, you conclude a divine Right for a standing Prelacie.

But take breath a little, and consider, Presbyteriana do justlie deny that Timothy and Titus were anie such Prelate Pastors over other Pastors with such a power as was exercised by the one at, and confined unto Ephesus, and by the other at Crete, and no where else. Your Dictator like afections cannot be admitted as a probation. If you had done any thing to purpose, you should have proven by some irrefragible arguments that which you alledge; this you have not yet done, and I am not afraid that ever you will do it. Now if these two holie servants of Christ were no such Prelates, and were not confined in the exercise of their power unto the places you mention; whether you make it a sole power or a chief power, it is no matter, then what comes of your poor standing Ministry by Imparity? do you think that your phillistophilism will support it? If you speak according to your own doctrine, as above you must of necessity yield it to be a Sophism, and tho you put a fair face on it as you can with your impudent assurance of its being a true and regular Syllogism, free of all infirmities and fault, & that it is unanswered & unpast from by you, P. 26. Yet it is evident to sense that you are convinced in your self that it is but a meer cheat, and therefore shamingly enough you pass from it, as it was formerly framed, and for your own credit you are content to Couper it over again; You see the rotten slaves will do no good; and therefore you will change them, and put in some new ones.

Let the Reader take notice from Page 26, he has two or three things to doe to prepare his way before he bring forth his reformedo, 1. He rejects the help

He sayes if I deny the Major, I must give a clear reason for it, and (that with his veritie) I le not fall upon, before the term called Nevermore. But according to the old proverb, *Fools set long term widely*. Notwithstanding all the barking of the old Tike, I'll again set down my former parallell beside this his argument, and if the one be as weak as water, the other is so too, as anie may see that has but common sense.

If the Christians answer, saying Moses way of worship is done away be good and relevant against the Jews arguing for it, Then the Turks, and other Mahometans their answer to the Christians arguing for the standing way of Christ, saying that it is done away, is good and relevant against the Christians. But the Christians will not grant this, Therefore they ought not to plead that. If his argument be unanswerable, this must be so too; for it is an exact parallell to it in point of form, and way of argumentation, so that it will follow that if the one be valid in favours of the Episcopallians against Presbyterians, the other is valid for the Jews against Christians.

Tho the Reply that he makes to this in his Self-Condensation *Ps. 113*, be mingled with Gall and Vennom according to his ordinary, Yet it is but very mean and lilly, yea utterly impertinent, and if he 1 pot on his Spectacles and again compare the two together, except he be very brutish, he will be convinced of it. He says, 'the Presbyterians (tho but one) second in framing this argument do miserably Symbolize with the Turks.' Answer. Then I have the same ground to say you Symbolize with the Quakers and other Sectaries. But wherein do I Symbolize with the Turks? In laying as much weight on the authority of Mahomets Alcoran, as that of the Holy Scriptures. Py for shame, a man that would be counted a non-so wise, to speak so brutishly. Do you not see that you and your argument, lay as much weight on the Quakers Light and Doctrine as I do on the Alcoran, and will you grant then that you lay as much weight on the Quakers Light and Doctrine, as you do on the Scriptures? If you do not, then what miserable juggling must it be for you to say that I lay as much weight on the Alcoran, as on the Scriptures. I abhor it with utmost detestation; and by imputing of it unto me from my parallell, you draw upon your self the guilt of Symbolizing with Quakers and other Sectaries, and of laying as much weight upon the Authority of their Patrons and Doctrines, as that of the Holy Scriptures.

Next you say you deny the connexion of the major, and that because of this disparity, viz. The Christians answer is good against the Jew, because founded on Scripture, &c. but the Turks answer against the Scripture is not good, being founded on Mahomets deceiving Alcoran. But are you indeed so verie blind as not to discern that the connexion of the major of

your own Foolish argument will run the same Fate with the other, for it is just like that which you deny, and is there not as good reason to deny the one as the other? For when Presbyterians call the Apostles extraordinary, and their Office temporarie; they speak according to the Holie Scriptures, whereas when Quakers and other Sectaries call standing Presbytrie extraordinary and temporarie, they speak not according to truth, but according to their Patrons, and their own Delusions, even as Turks do against the Christians, and so you have a sufficient reason why the major of your darling Argument is denied. But I would ask a word in the by, pray, what are these Quakers or Sectaries that call a standing Presbytrie extraordinary and temporarie, as you insinuate? It's a question if it be a just Charge against them: You will do well to publish some clear Evidence of it, lest some of them call you a Liar, when you have nothing to say for your self.

However you may see that if it was but a mock paralell that I offered, it is but a mock argument you so much boast of; and if you, that is so strict, in your accounts with the Weaver, will but measure both Webs with the same just Ellwand, you will find they are exactlie of the same breadth & length; You may likewise, if you please, take a look of another of the same kind, having the same dimensions, with that admired birth of your solid brain, you will find the one will do as well as the other.

If Episcopalians calling a standing paritie among Pastors an Humane Invention, be valid against Presbyterians. Then the Independents calling Imparitie among Pastors an Humane Invention, is also valid against the Episcopalians. But the Episcopalians will not grant this, Ergo they ought not to plead that.

Now, say, Sir, Is not this as unanswerable an Argument against the Episcopalians, as yours is against Presbyterians? a hundred more of the like Form might be adduced, whereby great absurdities might be proven, if your Argument were of any Force, unless to prove the wildness of him that framed it. Why did you take so much pains to dress it up with such an antick Vale upon it? Was it to amuse People that knew no better? might you not with less adoe have let it openlie appear with its own well favoured face, this is the whole upon the matter that it amounts to, 'If Presbyterians speaking truth ought to be believed, then Quakers and Sectaries venting Error and Falshood ought to be believed also, but this will not be granted, therefore that ought not to be pleaded. Now Men may see and judge of his prettie babble Argument.

After his impertinent and wicked Answer to the first Paralell foresaid, p. 23. He falls again a ranting, and among other things, he says, his Answer

has illuminated mine Eyes, and caused these Scales of gross Ignorance to fall from them: The Reader sees, he's still the same man he was, and that he has no need of the Coat he spake of; And if after all this he shall yet avers that his Argument is good, regular, unanswered, and unpass from then the old Tyke will be justlie numbered with the Donners, Blocks and Brutes mentioned in these Pamphlets.

I proceed next to consider what he replies unto the Answers I gave to his other grand Argument. In page 8. of his Imparitie, he offered to prove by an Argument that the Apostles, and consequentlie Timothee and Titus were not extraordinarie Officers of the Church. His Argument follows in these words, 'If they were, then it is either because their Office did partly consist in their extraordinarie Qualifications, immediat Mission, &c. Or because it consisted in the Architectonical power of building the Church; but not in the first, nor the last, therefore &c.

In repeating this Argument I began thus, If the Apostles, and Timothee and Titus were extraordinarie &c. he says, I leave out, *Consequently*. But that is not expressed in his Syllogism by himself. Unto his Argument I answered by denying the major simpliciter, and gave my Reason, and shewed that he did not at all prove his Point, viz. that the Apostles were not Extraordinary, and I concluded with this, that his Argument is nothing to the purpose as to Timothee and Titus; for this he taxes me as inconsequential and inconsiderate; I am not much moved at it, for so do brain-sick men judge of all who differ from themselves; But is not this self-evident that if his Argument hold not in behalf of the Apostles, that it is nothing to the purpose as to Timothee and Titus, seeing he drew them in by consequence.

Page 37. l. 19. He says that I have not onlie Brother Vetches but Brother Forresters Arguments to answer &c. But he it known to him that he shall not so divert me from himself; As for Mr. Vetch he was a Learned and Holie Man, and is now beyond the reach of all his Enemies, I cannot hear that ever he published anie Book, and I know not but all that this man pretends to have from him, is but his own Fiction. And as for the Reverend Mr. Forrester, who, tho abused by this black-mouth'd Accuser of the Brethren in p. 36. he is nevertheless for his singular Pietie and Literature justlie had in Reputation by all that truly know him, I honour him, and am willing to Learn of him, yea to submit anie thing of mine unto his Correction, if any. But my business is with this *Imparitie* man himself alone, who tho he set himself indifferently to sow Disord among Brethren, and so proclaims himself to be one of the Seven whom the LORD hates, and who are an abomination to Him, Prov. 6. 16, 19. Yet I hope he shall never reach his

Design, and that he labours in vain, seeing *opinionum varietas & opinantium*
 He observes that I said, the Apostles' extraordinary Qualifications and
 Mission contribute to the specification of their Office: But Sir, you Elude
 my Office-bearers, for my words in the Print are these, they contribute on-
 to the specification both of the Office and Office-bearers. Do you indeed
 yield it, that these Qualifications and Mission contribute to the specification
 of the Office-bearers; let me know it by your next: and then I'll tell you
 more of my mind.

He adds page 39. 1. 1. That I speak a little too generally, and if I speak
 to the purpose I must mean, and so he takes it, that I said Qualifications
 and Mission do contribute formally to the specification of the Office &c.
 But what a cheating Trick is this, Neighbour, to put your false Gloss on
 my words, and then give out, I must own it. This deceitful way can ne-
 ver hold out, Is there not a *principium specificationis effectivum*? Is there not
 also a *principium manifestativum*? and if the *principium effectivum* and *manifestativum*
 each of them do contribute in their own way unto specification, what hin-
 ders then, but that Mission and Qualifications may contribute unto the spe-
 cification of a sacred Office, tho they do not formally constitute the same?
 and if so then by the Argument that you raise upon your own false Suppo-
 sition, you do nothing else but fight against your own shadow.

I had told in the second Edition page 17. upon what account the Apo-
 stles were extraordinary Office-bearers; namelie upon the account of these
 three put together, 1. Their extraordinary Qualifications and Gifts. 2.
 Their extraordinary Mission, or Call. And 3. Their extraordinary Of-
 fice and Work. And that this last consisted in these things, viz Their As-
 sur'd onick power of building the Church of Christ, by edifying the Chris-
 tian Church consisting of Jews and Gentiles after Christ's Ascension ex ha-
 cu possibilibus in istum existentia, by Ministering in the Name of Christ
 new Offices, and appointing new Officers in the Church, by setting up, &
 establishing the Order of the Gospel Church, and by prescribing unalterable
 Rules for governing the Church to the Worlds end. As also it consisted
 in their preaching infallible Doctrine, and confirming it by Miracles, and
 finally, in their Teaching, Baptizing, Ordaining, and then spreading
 Actual Jurisdiction in all places whereever they could go without being
 to any City, Province, Countrey, Kingdom, or Quarter of the Earth.
 And in these three put together, the Apostles were extraordinary Office-
 bearers in the Church, and therein they had no Successors.

Now what has this non-~~so~~ Wise to except against these things? Page 14
40, 11. of his Pamphlet. First, he launches his ill-natured Clause of the last
thing I mentioned, which he says he pretends to be false, viz. The Apostles
educing the Christian Church consisting of Jews and Gentiles after Christ's
Ascension from a state of possibility into a state of existence, his Argument
follows. These who have the power of educing an aggregated Body con-
sisting of two parts out of the state of possibility into the state of existence
have power to educe both its parts out of the state fore-said. But
the Apostles had not power of educing both parts of the Christian Church
out of the state to the state fore-said; ergo, the Apostles had not power of
educing the aggregated Body, as said is.

I answer, by denying the major, because it is not universallie true, as in
this and other Cases; He says the major is self-evident, which I deny; he
says, there is no way to make an aggregated Body consisting of two parts;
but by the parts of which it consists, and yet at the same time. He adds it is impossible
to bring a Body consisting of two parts out of the state of possibility into
the state of existence, unless both parts be in the state of possibility. But that
I deny, Is there never a Body consisting of two parts which cannot be si-
mul but successively brought to existence, and if there be, then of necessity
the one part must be brought to existence before the other; As may be
the one be a wall six months and more before the other, but suppose a
House intended, to consist of two parts, a Foundation, and Superstructure
there, and the Foundation already laid and consequently existent but here
is yet no Superstructure. Now I pray, Monsieur, Is it impossible to build
that House, consisting of both parts, in actual existence, for to build the rest
that's wanting? Are you not ashamed to speak as that rascal Rverie Man
that has a skill of these things will laugh at your Follie. As for your other
satch, viz. If one part be in the state of existence, the Body inadequately is
also in the state of existence, it implies a contradiction and contradic-
tion. Is a Body made up of two parts, existing in such, before it be exis-
tent in both parts? Is one single part the whole aggregated Body? If your
inadequate & inadequate existence of such a Body be duly pondered, you'll be
found to be but what you are, a meer notional pre-~~advised~~ Learning. The
aggregated Body of Christ consisting of Jews and Gentiles could not be such
be in the state of existence before the latter as well as the former who exist
cont. and the existence of the latter as of the former, viz. the Jewish part be-
ing presupposed the being of the latter and of the latter the former
aggregation is not. It is evident the Apostles had and exercise the power
fore-said, they actually educed the Christian Church consisting of Jews
and

and Gentiles, out of the state of possibility into the state of existence by being the first and chief Instruments of the Gentiles Conversion after Christs Ascension, and so of bringing them into one with the believing Jews.

This matchless Scribler is at much pains from the middle of page 40. to make it appear from Scripture that the Gentile part of the Christian Church was in the state of existence before Christs Ascension, and therefore the Apostles did not educe that part from possibility to existence. But in all this he labours in vain, for the Scripture favours not his Cause. Let it be considered. 1. That the Scripture clearly teaches us there was no Christian Church of Jews and Gentiles unite together till after the Death of Christ, for till then the Gentiles were far off, there was a middle wall of Partition between the Jews and them, which could not be broken down but by the Death of Christ &c. See Eph. 2. from verse 13. to the end. 2. Is it not likewise clear that the Gentiles had the Gospel first brought to them by the Apostle Peter, Acts 13. 7. and 14. verse compared together. God made choice among us (said Peter) that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the Gospel and believe. Simeon hath declared (said James) how GOD at the first did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a People for His Name; and this was after Christs Ascension. Is not the way how Peter was induced to go to the Gentiles set down? Acts 15. from verse 10. through the Chapter and verse 45. they of the Circumcision, (that is, the Jews,) who were with Peter, were astonished, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the Gift of the Holy Ghost, which implies, the like never was before. And Cap. 11. 1. the Apostles and Brethren heard that the Gentiles had received the Word of God. This was thought a strange thing & some of the Jews challenged Peter for going to the Gentiles, and after he had sufficientlie apologized for himself, it is said, verse 18. They glorified God, saying, then hath God also to the Gentiles granted Repentance unto Life, a new thing indeed, as appears from the whole of that History. And then it was that the Church, consisting of Jews and Gentiles, came to its existence. The Apostles and New Testament Prophets had the Gospel committed to them, that the Gentiles might be made Fellow heirs, and of the same Body with the Jews, Eph. 3. 5. 6.

And hence, all the Examples he adduces make nothing for him. As for the 300 Brethren, 1 Cor. 13. 1. If my Adversarie can prove there was anie Gentile among them, let him do it; for I deny it. As for that Nobleman, John 4. 46. Let him prove also that he was a Gentile. The Centurion Mat. 8. was not a Jew, but a Profelyte to their Religion, like his Brother of trade, Mat. 10. 3, 2. and consequently, to be reckoned a Member of the Jewish Church.

Church. The like I say of the Canaanitish woman, *Matth. 15. 22.* As for the Samaritans, *John 4. 39. 41.* The Scripture reckons them not uncircumcised Gentiles, for the Gospel came first to the Gentiles by Peter, as is said; but the Samaritans heard it, and believed long before. So that they were not Gentiles as contradistinguished from Jews, according to the dialect of the New Testament. They were indeed a mongrel sort of People consisting partly of the Posterity of the Chaldeans, and partly of apostat Israelites and Jews. Josephus tells us 'that about the time of building their Temple, diverse both Priests, and common people, retired themselves to Manasseh (a Jew) Son-in-Law to Sanballat, and took up in Samaria. And again, 'diverse Jews were there who revolted from their Nation. And again, 'if any were accused in Jerusalem of any great Fault, he fled unto the Sichesimites, or Samaritans &c. Joseph. Antiq. lib. 11. cap. 8. From which it is ealie to gather that not a few of them in Christs time were the Posterity of Israelites and Jews. Moreover they lived in the same Countrey with the Jews, and were circumcised as they, and acknowledged the five Books of Moses; wherefore they are not to be reckoned of the uncircumcision or the Greeks, as the Gentiles contradistinguished from the Jews are called in the New Testament; See *Act. 10. 21. Ephes. 2. 11.*

By all which it is very clear that his Argument & Exceptions against what I said of the Apostles being extraordinary, are but impertinent Notions; and his Argument restor'd in form Page 41. 42. is but one of his Castles in the air, instead of its being a perpetual pick-tooth to me (as he would have it) it's but an empty babble filter for his own secret use at home; and still my description of the Apostles Office remains as a firm bone for an old Tyke to gnaw upon.

After all his former sputter, he comes page 45. last 8. to make some semblance of contrition, tho still the venom breaks out among hands, and he will needs prove there is Imparity among ordinary Pastors. Thus, 'Timothy and Titus with the Ephesian and Cretan Presbyters were ordinary Pastors, but there was Imparity among them, therefore there is Imparity among ordinary Pastors in Scripture. Answ. The major is denied. To confirm it, he proves Timothy and Titus were not extraordinary Pastors, thus, 'The Apostles were not extraordinary Pastors, therefore Timothy & Titus were not. Answ. The antecedent is False. He says he has proven it by his second argument above, and that is False too, as is already seen. He says he'll prove it also by his first argument. But that is also answered, and the senselessness thereof discovered, I need not repeat.

By this time the Reader may perceive the things he calls his arguments do
[neither,

neither make for his own, nor for the credite of his Cause, seeing they prove nothing at all, unless it be, that the Author of them is a bad Philosopher, and a worse Divine. All that he says, page 18. about Diocesan Prelats, is but vapouring in the Wind; for the Question is about their Office, whether it be of Divine Institution, and not about their Diocesanity, as he terms it, pag. 10. from the middle; he says *by his Argument he disproves my notion of an Evangelists Work*. But that argument is invisible, and there he passes from me, and falls on the Definition of Evangelists given by a Reverend Divine, and batters against it; I shall not put my sickle in another mans harvest, especially seeing there is no need. But when my adversary doth unjustly attack my self, I resolve not to let him go without Controll.

There are some other things in his Pamphlet, which tho unworthy of regard, yet lest he insult, because of my silence, I shall take a little notice of them; He appears very wroth because he was charged with self-conceit, & vain gloriation, but instead of clearing himself thereof, he has put it beyond all doubt that the Charge is just, he is indeed condemned by himself, so as there is no need of Witnesses for his Exculpation. Take some of his own words. He saith page 33 l. 13. 'I knew the Writings of their most famous Authors, I had written against them, could answer all their arguments, and knew more of the Controversie than all of them, this I said, and this I own &c. and again ibid. l. 11. 'I may be pardoned to alledge I can, when I apply my self to it, search to the bottom of a particular Controversie, thirty years are now elapsed since I was pretty well acquainted with the Controversie &c. He shews also that he has written against Mr. Durham, Mr. Jameson, Mr. Forrester, Mr. Rule, Mr. Verch, and that in effect he has done all their Business. He says page 34 l. 13. 'I may seem to be no Novice in this Controversie. Page 38 l. 10. 'I have defeated all the former Notions, I found of it in their Authors. And line 27. that the World take notice that here they frankly acknowledge that by my argument, as it were with sword in hand, I have attacked and beat the whole Party &c. Now let the Tree be judged by its Fruits, and this Man by his Words, then it must be concluded, that either this is a most self-conceited, and vain-glorious Hector, or that there never was any such in the World. Was you afraid, Sir, lest some had denyed you to be such a man, that you have been at so much pains to make it out to the conviction of all who read you? Nay, more, it's very apparent that his proud affectation of being counted a non-so Wise doth now and then cast him into strange fits of Frenzie, as page 35. where he says that nill I, will I, I shall clear him of being self-conceited, because I told my opinion of the Apostles Office, as before reported; Therefore according to
 . him

him; I acknowledge he knew more than all the famous Authors for Presby-
try, and that he was Wise in Religion, and that his *Principles* were *very* *useful* *to* *the* *Church*. This is indeed a very odd piece of Flattery, and what man that is not
like himself, but most think he is cracked and craz'd in his Head: Does he
not hereby give a further proof of his being *octavius lapientum*, when he
thus turns the old Proverb, that is *the Fool thinks the Bell clinks*.

Another thing I notice, he strongly alleges, yea seems positive in it,
that I had the concurrence and help of others in compiling the second Edition,
pag. 12, l. 22. *The Presbyterian, or further Presbyterian, for no doubt the Brethren*
have in concert, pag. 23, l. 27 *Our Author and his Accomplices*, and elsewhere
his Coadjutors. This is yet a further evidence of his unaccountable Vanity,
he looks on himself as so mighty a man, that a single deferter, as he calls him,
dare not appear against him, unless he have assistance; Nay, as would have
men to believe, that he is able to rout him, and all on his side, yea that he
has done it already, but he is miserably mistaken, for that same man alone
with whom he debated in the *Shop*, without getting or seeking assistance of
any man, drew up the *foremost Edition*, and doth now again make the *floud*
seems upon the *swaying* *out* *Keller* *there*. If I should in need of my Bre-
thers help in any thing, upon which they would not refuse it, but it were a
shame for me to seek help against such a trifling Scoundrel, especially when his
Best Artillery are but great swelling words of Vanity, fiery Passion, bitter
Taunts and Revilings, and base Forgeries and Falshoods, whereby he hurts
himself more than any other; Beside these, there is little else behind in all his
Works that I have seen, so that I am not afraid (how weak soever I be) to
appear alone against him, even tho he be supplied with the never failing
Magazine of his Notes that he contrives in his Chamber. Page 5. line 5.

Another Forgerie he had in his Imparity, page 30. l. 4. which I thought
not worth the notice, now in his self-Condernnation, page 12. line 23. He
comes over it again, viz. that I called it an answer to some of my acquaintance,
because I disregarded it, he says *it is not refused by me &c.* A good conse-
quence indeed; But pray what Familiar told you that I said so? Tell him
from me, he is but a lying Spirit, and if you was informed by your Notes,
then sure they are False and Forged.

It is very observable that his manner is to cast Reproaches on me, and to
bespatter me with the very Crimes he is guilty of himself, V. C. Falshood,
How oft does he impute it to me, when himself is truly the Criminal? He
says that *Falshood has no feet*, but he supplies that Defect, for he makes his
Falshood to fly with Wings, as I can instance in many particulars, beside
those already hinted, Page 11. l. 15. He tells the World, *It is most false that*
C

I said the Quakers were against a standing Ministry; and I tell him and the World both, that he speaks most falsely. Page 32. line 11. that I charge him most frequently with Rage, Fury, Bawling, and Scolding, in the second Edition. But, any that reads it may see it is very seldom. Page 47. l. 18 He says of himself *that he boasts of nothing, but the Cross of Christ*; But all that read him do see that he boasts himself to be some body, that he brags of his imaginary Wisdom and Abilities, that he vaunts of his whimsical Arguments, as invincible, and that he glories in his own shame. Nay this affronted man is not afraid to vent a horrible Falshood unto God in his Prayer, I find in his Pamphlet he prayst twice, page 30. line 7 and again page 48. both times he prays for others, not for himself, tho he has need enough to pray that his own eyes may be opened &c. Has he not cause to fear that these his Prayers be turned into sin? Men are commanded to pray without Wrath: 1 Tim. 2. 8. Sacrifices brought with an evil mind are an abomination to the Lord. Prov. 21. 27. If we regard iniquity in our Hearts, the Lord will not hear. Let him apply to himself. Men are not to offer unto the Lord any unclean thing: Is not a gross Falshood such a thing? and this he offers in his Prayer. Neither he, nor any of his Faction has ever brought a clear Warrant for Prelacy from the Scriptures. Yet he prays pag. 30. l. 13. 'That the Presbyterians eyes may be opened &c. that they may no more refuse to embrace the Truth (that is Prelacy) so clearly express in the Holy Bible, as they cannot shift the evidence, but by speaking without Book, and yielding their Cause unto Quakers. This Article of his Prayer includes a horrible Falshood; no wonder that he utter Falshood to Men, when he is thus so very daring to vent himself unto the dreadful God. Beside these, and many more untruths that he has told, there is something further that is called *contra mentem* inc; whereof he is sadly culpable, as page 8 line 15. *It is all Romance but what he takes with*. Page 43. l. 12. that I check'd him not for rudeness in the Shop. Tho these things be said by him, yet his Conscience can witness the contrair. There is one more which I notice, page 47. l. 14. He says 'that upon the matter I signified my desire that he would be assum'd by the Presbyterians. This I utterly disown, I never desired him either on the Matter or in Form, I spake of these that are deserving, whereof he is none, my Words are in Print. Seeing he had rather be a horn'd Cow as joyn with Presbyterians, I had rather he should continue so, than that such a Fire-brand should come among them. Now what shall be given to thee, or what shall be done unto thee, thou false Tongue? Psal. 120. 3. Notwithstanding all his Vanity & Vennom, yet he has the confidence to lay claim to that Scripture, Prov. 18. 1. *The Righteous are hold as a Lyon*. But alas! is it not a sad abuse of Scripture thus

to misapply it? Is a man, that thinks himself something, when he is nothing, and so deceives himself, a Man that's proud like Lucifer? a Man that madly insults over others? a Man that is grossly culpable for Forgerie, Falshood, and worie, Is such a Man one of the Righteous? Surely no. It is said, Prov. 12. 10. *A Righteous Man regards the Life of a Beast, but the Tender Mercies of the Wicked are Cruel.* Is it not too evident that my Imparity man is much more of the latter than of the former see his own Words p. 11 at the middle, *Let the Brethren sheath their Swords in one anothers Sides, fight Dogs, fight Bears, I am no ways concerned.* And page 17. line 30. *Let the Brethren meet and brance one another from Pillar to Post for me.* Is not this too Cains like, and an Argument of Merciless Cruelty and Bloody Mindedness? the Tender Mercies of the Wicked are Cruel. And what a Mockers of GOD must he be, that pretends to pray for us, and yet would see us all destroyed? By these things it is clear, he must quite his Pretensions unto Prov. 12. 10. and content himself with Prov. 14. 16.

Another specimen of his Imaginary Wisdom is his palpable inconsistency with himself; take one Instance page 25. line 30. 'That it's most unaccountable and unworthy for any to pretend that Scots Episcopal Divines plead for sole power of Ordination and Jurisdiction &c. And yet pag 34. at the beginning, he says that himself has written against Mr. Rule, maintaining a Bishop has sole Power &c. Sure then it's neither unworthy nor unaccountable to say that a Scots Episcopal Divine pleads for it, else he must grant himself to be no such Divine. There be several other Instances thereof of which are not worth the while to come over, and therefore I forbear.

The old surly Tyke barks most unjustly against the second Edition, yea oftentimes he shews his Teeth, but bites none except himself; for that little Paper contains the Words of Truth and Sobriety, which are rarely, if at all, found with him; It's his ordinary in his self-Condemnation to call Truth Falshood, and Falshood Truth (which is to call Good Evil, and Evil Good) and to enforce all with great swelling Words of Vanity and impetuous out-breaking of fiery Passion, which become neither a Christian, nor a Divine.

Before he close this worthless Piece of his, he tells page 47. he had a great Aversion from appearing in Print, and this restrained him from it (O how self-deny'd!) tho' importun'd by several; But what made you at last to break the restraint? He says a little before, had not I signified a desire that he would be assum'd by the Presbyterians, and that the Terms were easie, the World had not seen his Arguments (It's False that I signified any such Desire) but can it be supposed that a few words from me prevailed more with you than all the Importunity of your Friends? Who, that has Eyes, but must see this.

ing to be a meer foolish Pretence by your troubling the Press, and the World too open to light an occasion: It appears you would far have been in Print, and that your Pretence of Aversion was but meer Hypocrisie: thou had been so that I had spoken a few words, what needed that more you play the Fool and Mad-man, as you have done before the World.

It seems the Moon has been near the Full when he concluded his Self-Condernation, for that then his Distraction was at a great height appears manifestly by his calling to all Kirk Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies to answer his Arguments: who else but a Lunatick would have done so? and when he has any lucid intervals, he may see that's already done in the second Edition, and by this Stone returning upon him that Roll d is. Advise him to confess and forsake his own Sin, and to pray for Pardon of all his Folly and Madnes, and to bless GOD for it, that he is not in Hell before now: for according to that of the Wise man, with a little Variation, Eccl. 10. 13. *The beginning of the words of his Boob is Folly, and the end of his Talk there is Madness.*

AN EPISTLE

TO MY RIGHT RAVEING

ADVERSARY

SIR,

THOU some be apt to think you was under the powerfull Influence of some malicious Genius when you Compa'd your former Pieces: Iat I conceive your Distemper proceeds mostly from overflowings of the Gall with
Hypon.

*Hypochondriack Vapours and Flatuosities which much disturb
 your Metaphysical Brain. What you had from me before
 in the first Paper has had some Effect, it has made you
 write six Sheets full of naughty Stuff; I hope this In-
 closed Stone may be more Operative, for it has a little
 more Acrimony; but capiat cum vehiculo, I mean with
 a good quantity of the Creature (whereof you would have
 administred to me in the Shop Page 32. and whereof some
 then thought you had gotten too much) and that will make
 the Operation more easie, and the Evacuations more plen-
 tiful; for I know you cannot be Laconick at such Occasi-
 ons, as you hint, Page 4. To quicken the Operation, Reci-
 pe as follows, I was of Opinion that you were so Mighty
 a Giant for Prelacy, that if you could have got any to
 joyn with you, you would in the most publick Place have
 cryed out for the space of two Hours together, as Act. 19.
 34. Great is Diana of the Ephesians, Great is Prelacy of the
 Diotrephesians. But now upon second Thoughts about your
 Procedure I begin to doubt it's not so much for Prelacy you
 Contend, as to maintain your own rotten Notions; for tho
 it is evident you give not the least Aid unto that grand
 Cause, yet you Fight for those, as it were, with Tooth and
 Nail; and tho poor Prelacy should suffer for it, you'll give
 it no better Props: However because it's said (which
 your Sauciness has not observed) Let another man Praise
 thee, and not thine own mouth, Prov. 27. 2. Laus proprio
 fordescit in ore. I'll take upon me for once to sound your
 Praise. You have indeed made a brave Campaign this
 last Season, you have done such mighty Exploits, as no Ba-
 dy can tell what; but the most remarkable Execution you
 have*

have made is that at one Blow you have cut off three Great Men, I mean three of that Venerable Fraternity, Smeſymnus. for Page 22. lin. 23 there is no more but Smece. Stephen Marshall and Edw. Calamy are only to the fore; but Thom. Young, Matth. Neucom: and Will. Spurilow are snickt away no more to be seen. O great Victory! what Honour shall be done you at your Return? Will you have a Triumph, or an Ovation? You must tell it your self, for if it be Referred to others, they'l say, you Deserve none of them, because the Men were Dead before you fell upon them; that if they had been Alive, you durst not have fac'd any one of them, and that they have left behind them a Monument whereby; tho Dead, yet they Speak; and which you can no more Overturn, than an old Tyke can break the hardest Adamant. And further they'll add that you have but cut off some Letters of their Names. It's said of the Leopard that it so hates a Man, that when it sees his very Picture, it flies upon it, and tears it; an old Tyke may have something of the Nature of that Man-bating Beast, he may so hate the Memory of Honest Men, as to Tear their very Names where he sees them. I perceive by your Page 47. you are yet upon some Great Design, ye tell surprizing News, that you, even you, have cross'd the Rubicon. Now, now, aut Cæsar, aut nihil, the terrible Bombs of your mouldy Manuscripts are ready to be discharged, parturiunt montes &c. But before you enter the Lists with others, as you threaten, were it not fit to clear your Accounts with me? This I demand of you as just. We are not now in the Shop, where little could be said or heard for your roaring Noise and Banter, You have

have brought me (tho against my Inclination) to appear before the World, where be Witnesses abundance of all that passes between you and me, and before them all I require you to Prove these your Assertions in your Pamphlet, for I deny them? 1. That all Pastors of the Church, Apostles and others, were and are ordinary Officers, and that there were never any extraordinary. 2. That Timothy was not an Evangelist when Paul wrote his Epistles to him, as Page 9. line 1. 3. That Timothy's Power of Ordination & Jurisdiction belonged to him as a Bishop, and not as an Evangelist. And, 4. That the Exercise of his said Power was Confyn'd to Ephesus only, as P. 10. line 1. It's clear you have yet done nothing to Purpose for Evincing those things, and you are concern'd in Credite yet to do it before you go further. I do not much wonder that such a Man as you has cross'd the Rubicon, within a few days March to Rome. There are three things make me dread your hasting to it, as the Place where you Desire to be. 1. Your viperous Bitterness against sound Protestants. 2. Your Endeavour to cast Fire-brands among them, and so to break them among themselves. And 3. The smell of your corrupt Argument, Page 5 at the middle. It runs thus, Imparity among Pastors is of Divine Institution, but Episcopacy is Imparity among Pastors, Ergo, Episcopacy is of Divine Institution. And so you can Prove the Papacy to be of Divine Institution; Thus Imparity among Pastors is of Divine Institution, But Papacy is Imparity among Pastors, Ergo, The Papacy is of Divine Institution too. Did you concert with the Fathers of Trent as you past by to the Rubicon? However your Argument will do well enough at Rome, and

When spring is this time you are drawing near that dangerous
Season, be carefull to have all things in readiness for your
Defence, and be sure to Consult all your Lying Devils, that
you may know what to say before his Hellishness when you
are admitted to Audience. I add no more, but hoping
you'll send abroad your Arguments, which I require, for
at least you'll give account how my Physick works with you
in some more Sheets full of the Malignant Stuff it can see you
to cast up, that so I may know what to Order for you when
I rest

Yours most antient

7 AP 62